

Applicant: J. Bruce Pitner et al.
Application Serial No.: 09/642,504
Amendment dated: August 5, 2003
Reply to Office Action of February 7, 2003
Docket No.: 102-554 (P-276P1P1P1)
Page 11

D. Remarks

The status of the claims in the application to date is as follows: 1-12, 14-16, 49-62, and 91-102 are in the application. Claims 1-12, 14-16, 49-62, and 91-102 have been rejected. Claims 92 and 98 are canceled herein. Claims 93, 94, 96, 99, 100 and 102 are amended herein. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner has requested the status of the related applications be updated in the specification. The cross reference data has been entered by this amendment obviating the grounds for the objection.

In addition, the Examiner has requested the Applicants inform the Examiner as to how this application differs from each of the parent applications so the proper priority date may be granted. The request for this delineation is respectfully traversed in view of the present amendment. The lineage of the parent case is now set forth. The Examiner's attention is called to the fact that certain of these cases are continuation-in-part applications. These continuation-in-part applications claim common priority for common subject matter as is permitted by the rules of practice. In absence of a specific rejection directed to certain subject matter, undersigned counsel is unaware of any requirement to make the delineation requested by the Examiner. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Response to Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 92, 96, 98 and 102 as allegedly containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. The Examiner further alleges that Table 12 does not disclose the materials listed therein. Claim 92 and 98 have been canceled obviating the grounds of rejection. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection with respect to the remaining claims.

Applicant: J. Bruce Pitner et al.
Application Serial No.: 09/642,504
Amendment dated: August 5, 2003
Reply to Office Action of February 7, 2003
Docket No.: 102-554 (P-276P1P1P1)
Page 12

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are sufficiently supported in the specification. Regarding claim 91, biomaterials are discussed generally, for example, on page 24, lines 14-16 of the specification. Regarding claims 96 and 102, additives or coatings are disclosed in numerous locations throughout the specification. Penicillin and streptomycin are disclosed in Example 18 on page 43; fungizole is disclosed in Example on page 42, line 25; non-essential amino acids are disclosed on page 48 in Table 12 and in the examples, such as Example 29 on page 50; and fetal calf serum, also referred to as fetal bovine serum or FBS, is disclosed in the examples, such as the materials and methods on page 42, Example 18 on page 43, Example 29 on page 50 and Example 39 on page 57. Additionally, sodium pyruvate is disclosed on page 48 in Table 12. It is clear from a thorough reading of the specification as a whole, which includes Table 12, that the components described as supplements in the table are understood as additives or supplements to sustain and/or promote growth. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 91, 96 and 102 contain subject matter which is sufficiently described in the specification to establish possession of the claimed invention. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 92, 98 and 102 is respectfully requested in light of the above.

Response to Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 91 to 102 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter the inventors regard as the invention. Furthermore, the Examiner has rejected the title of the invention as not aptly descriptive. The claims and title have been amended to address the rejections. These changes were not made for the purposes of defining or otherwise limiting the meaning of a term or for prior art purposes. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 91-102 and the title under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, in light of the above.

Applicant: J. Bruce Pitner et al.
Application Serial No.: 09/642,504
Amendment dated: August 5, 2003
Reply to Office Action of February 7, 2003
Docket No.: 102-554 (P-276P1P1P1)
Page 13

Response to Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-12, 14-16, 49-62 and 91-102 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over each of the article by Bacon and the article by Parker. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the Bacon reference teaches immobilization of certain ruthenium dyes in a silicone rubber for measuring oxygen concentrations. The Examiner alleges that the Parker article teaches use of fluorescence quenching of an anthracene dye to measure oxygen concentration which can be immobilized in a polymer such as silicone. The reactions may be performed in cuvettes.

The Examiner admits that the independent claims differ from the above references in that they recite the enzyme is in solution. Further, the dependent claims 5, 53, 8, 9, 56, 57, 14-16 and 60-62 differ from the references, yet concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the references to include these differences. The Examiner also states that no novelty is seen in employing repeated measurements as needed because no need is shown and no precision is required. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Before responding to the rejections, Applicants would like to summarize the invention. The present invention provides methods of identifying the presence or absence of oxidative reactions, such as those catalyzed by enzymatic activity, by contacting a sample or air above the sample with a sensor. The sensor includes a luminescent compound that is protected from destructive activity of the sample. The luminescent compound experiences a change in luminescent property which corresponds to a change in oxygen concentration. The change in oxygen concentration is proportional to the amount and/or rate of oxidative reduction reactions. The protection of the luminescent compound allows for detection of, for example, oxidative reactions occurring as a result of cells metabolizing a drug candidate, without destroying the sensor. It is possible to use the sensor in subsequent analyses because the sensor is not destroyed by the sample.

Applicant: J. Bruce Pitner et al.
Application Serial No.: 09/642,504
Amendment dated: August 5, 2003
Reply to Office Action of February 7, 2003
Docket No.: 102-554 (P-276P1P1P1)
Page 14

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection raised by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's statement of the teachings of Parker and Bacon. As discussed in detail below, the prior art, in combination with the knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, does not provide sufficient motivation to modify the references. Additionally, the prior art fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of the claims. As a result, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

In Bacon, problems of using luminescent compounds in detecting oxygen are discussed which include interference from gaseous or solution interferents. See page 2781, column 1. One solution to the problem, as discussed in the reference, is to isolate the dye by covalently attaching it to a material or to microencapsulate the dyes. The isolation is understood as useful to minimize leaching effects and to isolate the dye from the environment.

Another problem identified in Bacon, is that "In practice, an excited state (of a dye) that is susceptible to quenching by one species is generally susceptible to quenching by a variety of materials, and the number of interferents is large enough to make solution luminescence quenching nearly unusable." See page 2781, column 1, sixth full paragraph. The answer to the problem, as presented by Bacon, is to immobilize the oxygen sensor in a solvent impermeable-gas permeable polymer film. The degree of quenching of the excited complex is related to the partial pressure of O₂ in contact with the film.

According to Bacon, the film serves as an effective barrier to potential interferents such as gases (other than oxygen) and various solutions. The gases and solutions of concern in Bacon were related to those that would potentially damage the sensor dye or produce a false reading. Of particular concern were surfactants, strong oxidants, a reducing agent, a strong acid, and a strong base. See page 2782, column 1. The problem of interferents was

Applicant: J. Bruce Pitner et al.
Application Serial No.: 09/642,504
Amendment dated: August 5, 2003
Reply to Office Action of February 7, 2003
Docket No.: 102-554 (P-276P1P1)
Page 15

solved by providing the sensor in a film wherein the potential interferents including quenchers, solutions, or solvents do not penetrate the polymer, so as to avoid affecting the sensor concentration, degrading the sensor, or distorting the response.

The Bacon reference is silent, however, with respect to utility as an indicator of the presence or absence of oxidative reactions catalyzed by at least one enzyme by direct or indirect contact with a solution containing the enzyme. A fair reading of Bacon teaches that a complex sample, as is the case in which one or more enzymes is present, is likely to contain potential interferents. However, the success of the sensor of Bacon depends on the polymer in which the sensor is contained serving as an effective barrier to potential interferents. "In order for luminescence quenching to be a viable analytical method, potential interferent quenches must be excluded from the sensor while rapid penetration and equilibration of the quencher to which the sensor must respond were allowed." (emphasis added). See page 2781, column 1, sixth full paragraph. Bacon does establish that contact with gaseous halothane, cyclopropane, CO₂, and nitrous oxide did not affect performance of the sensor. However, these are a mere fraction of the interferents possible, especially in a sample containing enzymes, and which may also contain cells, growth media, and a multiplicity of other potential interferents.

The Bacon reference, for all that it discloses, fails to teach or even suggest the possibility that a sensor, in contact with a sample containing enzymes which catalyze oxidative reactions, would be impermeable to the materials in the sample, including the enzymes. Absent such teaching, it cannot fairly be said that Bacon teaches the method of the invention in which a sample, containing at least compounds which catalyze oxidative reactions, will not interfere with the performance of the sensor. Absent such teaching, it cannot fairly be said that the present invention is obvious in light of the Bacon reference.

Applicant: J. Bruce Pitner et al.
Application Serial No.: 09/642,504
Amendment dated: August 5, 2003
Reply to Office Action of February 7, 2003
Docket No.: 102-554 (P-276P1P1P1)
Page 16

In the Parker reference, two generic types of transducers for detecting oxygen concentration are disclosed, both of which are based on fluorescence quenching. One is a hydrophobic transducer and the other is a hydrophilic transducer. In each, a fluorophor is entrapped in a polymer.

The transducer is discussed as theoretically being amenable to provide a wider class of chemical sensors through coupling to other chemistries. See page 156, first full paragraph. "Similarly, the optical detection of oxygen by fluorescence quenching can be used to detect a wide range of chemicals by coupling the quenching to chemical reactions that either consume or produce oxygen when the desired analyte is present." See page 156, seventh full paragraph. To this end, a theoretical glucose/oxygen transducer is proposed to detect the presence of glucose.

In Parker, the transducers include immobilized glucose oxidase (GO_x) in a PHEMA polymer. See page 159, first full paragraph. "The enzyme was physically entrapped in the polymer by mixing it with the aqueous components of the polymerization mixture prior to polymerization." See page 157, fourth full paragraph. A chemical reaction occurs between the glucose and an oxidized form of glucose oxidase in the film to form a reduced form of glucose oxidase, which then consumes oxygen in a chemical reaction. The Parker reference therefore teaches that the analyte (in this case glucose) as well as the enzyme which reacts therewith (glucose oxidase), must be present in the polymer matrix of the transducer and perform a chemical reaction therein, in order to generate the detectable signal. This is in direct contrast to the present invention, where the luminescent compound is present in a polymer film, however, the enzymes are in a gas or solution located outside of the film.

The Parker reference teaches that the reaction to bind oxygen must occur in the film. This teaches away from the present invention because addition of the enzymes to the film would defeat the purpose of the invention, which is to provide a reversible, non-destructive

Applicant: J. Bruce Pitner et al.
Application Serial No.: 09/642,504
Amendment dated: August 5, 2003
Reply to Office Action of February 7, 2003
Docket No.: 102-554 (P-276P1P1P1)
Page 17

method of measuring oxidative reactions catalyzed by enzymes. Separation of the enzyme from the sample and entrapping it in a polymer with the luminescent compound would prevent the enzymatic activity intended to be measured from occurring. In contrast, the present invention provides a method in which the enzyme may contact the sensor but is not destroyed by such contact. This is what is meant by the limitation that the presence of the sensor is non-destructive to the enzyme. The Parker reference, for all it discloses, does not teach or even suggest such a possibility.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-12, 14-16, 49-62 and 91-102 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is appropriate in light of the above and is respectfully requested.

Having responded in full to the outstanding Office Action, it is respectfully submitted that the application, including claims 1-12, 14-16, 49-62, 91, 93-97 and 99-102, is in condition for allowance. An early notice of allowance is respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-2461.

Applicant: J. Bruce Pitner et al.
Application Serial No.: 09/642,504
Amendment dated: August 5, 2003
Reply to Office Action of February 7, 2003
Docket No.: 102-554 (P-276P1P1P1)
Page 18

If the Examiner has any questions or comments relating to the present application, he or she is respectfully invited to contact Applicant's attorney at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Joy I. Farber

Registration No.: 44,103

Attorney for Applicant(s)

HOFFMANN & BARON, LLP
6900 Jericho Turnpike
Syosset, New York 11791
(973) 331-1700